

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

				0 / = = - = - = - = - = - = - = - = -	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVE	NTOD		
		THIS NAMED INVE	NIOR		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/462,283 -	03/29/00	KOOPS		H	2345/108
026646 KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY		IM52/0731	7		EXAMINER
				AHMEI:	·. S
NEW YORK NY				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1746 DATE MAILED:	9
					07/31/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summer	09/462,283	KOOPS, HANS WILFRIED PETE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner		
The MANUAL DATE AND	Shamim Ahmed		
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	n appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by any reply received by the Office later than three months after the rearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reon. a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT	eply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	05 January 2000 .		
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑	This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for all closed in accordance with the practice un-	llowanaa assaatta s	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
Disposition of Claims		.,	
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7-14</u> is/are pending in the applica	ation.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	ornordoration.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7-14</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement		
pplication Papers	and an roquitornone.		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ ac	cented or h) objected to but he	For all	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) he held in abovens	Examiner.	
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) disa	Personal buttle F	
If approved, corrected drawings are required in	reply to this Office action	ipproved by the Examiner.	
12) $\square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the $\mathfrak l$	Examiner.		
iority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. & 1	19(a) (d) or (6	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	13(a)-(d) 01 (l).	
1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received		
2. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received in Appli	ication No	
Copies of the certified copies of the pri application from the International B     * See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	iority documents have been rec	eived in this National Stage	
4) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 LLS C . 3.4	10(a) (4-	
a) — The translation of the foreign language or	rovisional application has been		
Tokinowiedginein is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§	120 and/or 121	
	33		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summ	nary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)	
		nal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/462,283

Art Unit: 1746

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement filed March 29, 2000 and January 05, 2000 contain duplicate listing of references. Accordingly, the duplicate references are Canceled out from one of the listing.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 7-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brenner et al (XP-002058725) in view of Eguchi et al (Japanese Journal of Applied Physics) and further in view of Vollenbroek et al (USP 4,704,347).

Brenner et al describe a process to form an optoelectronic device, wherein a polymer is exposed by using an etching mask and then the unexposed regions are filled with monomers by gas-phase diffusion process (see page 159 and 161-162). Brenner et al fail to teach the monomer is organometallic compound. However, Eguchi et al teach a fabrication process of an optical waveguide with gradient index polymer, wherein monomers of organometallic compound with a lower refractive index are diffused into a gel containing substrate for low optical losses at the waveguide connection (page 2232). So, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ Eguchi

Art Unit: 1746

et l's teaching into Brenner et al's process for reducing the optical loss of the optical waveguide as taught by Eguchi et al.

As to claim 8, modified Brenner et al disclose that the polymer resist layer is polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) but fail to teach the patternable polymer layer is composed of novolak. However, Vollenbroek et al teach that photoresist layer composed of novolak has an advantage over PMMA layer, such as novolak has a considerable higher resistance to etching plasmas than the PMMA (col.2, lines 47-50).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of claimed invention to employ Vollenbroek et al's teaching into the combined Brenner et al's method by replacing PMMA resist with novolak resist because novolak has considerably higher resistance to etching plasmas than PMMA as taught by Vollenbroek et al.

#### Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Baker et al (4,824,522) disclose a fabrication process of polymer waveguides, wherein the pattern is transferred through the polymer layer by exposing the layer to a reactive ion etching; Lebby et al (5,116,461) disclose a method, wherein an optical medium of polymer is etched to form trenches and Hammer et al (5,102,776) teach that novolak resist is more sensitive than PMMA (col.3, lines 61 – col4, line 3).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shamim Ahmed whose telephone number is (703) 305-1929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:00-5:30) Every Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (703) 308-4333. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7718 for regular communications and (703) 305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0661.

Shamim Ahmed Examiner Art Unit 1746

SA July 28, 2001

> RANDY GULAKOWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700